



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

XIII.—THE GERMANIC SUFFIX *-AR-JA*.

Few of the Germanic suffixes have recently been discussed so often as the suffix *-ar-ja*, the most widespread and extensively used suffix of the Germanic dialects. Grimm's theory that this suffix is identical with the suffix *-ja* plus an additional *-r*, which, in a modified form, was adopted by Kluge in the first edition of his *Stammbildungslehre*, has been given up and most scholars seem now to agree with Sütterlin-Möller's explanation, according to which *-ar-ja* was borrowed from the Latin *ārius*.¹ This borrowing, as Orthoff suggests, must have been done at two different periods, because it would explain the twofold form *-ari* and *-āri* in O.H.G.

While this explanation appears quite plausible from a linguistic point of view, serious objections must be raised against it as soon as we examine it more closely. For the question arises at once when and in what way was our suffix borrowed from the Latin? Sütterlin in his little book, *Geschichte der Nomina Agentis im Germanischen* (p. 78 f.), answers this question as follows: "Das germanische Suffix seinerseits aber ist—wie wol auch das Keltische—aus dem Lateinischen entnommen. Auch hier lässt sich eine Reihe von Wörtern anführen, welche leicht aus dem einen Sprachgebiet in das andere hinüberleiten. Es sind meistens termini technici, für die dem alten Deutschen die einheimische Bezeichnung fehlte." The words which Sütterlin then quotes in support of his theory are all terms which belong to the sphere of clerical learning, few of which, like *kellndāri*, *chamerāri*, *cancelāri*, *notāri* and *schuolare* became afterwards terms of common life. It is true that in the older documents of the various Germanic dialects we find few words containing

¹ Cf. Wilmanns, *Deutsche Grammatik*, II, 282 ff.

the suffix *-ar-ja*. But many of these words like *fiskari*, *gardari* (*Heliand*); *baþere*, *húdere*, *maltere* (*Freckenhorster Heberolle*); *bindere*, *folgere*, *sceáwere*, *weorpere*, *reafere*, *scotere* (*Grein, Sprachschatz*) are terms which signify primitive occupations, and it seems to me inconceivable that the terms for these primitive occupations should have been changed, that Gothic *fisk-ja*, e. g., should have become O.H.G. *fisc-ari*, O.S. *fisk-ari*, *fisc-ere*, O. Fries. *fisk-er* for the sake of a few technical terms in *-ārius*, which originated among the clergy, and for which the common man had little use. Moreover, there is not a single case in O.H.G. of one of these words ending in *-ari* having a second form with the suffix *-ja*. If this were the case we could see how the suffix *-ari* had taken the place of suffix *-ja*, and, since *-ja* appears more frequently in Gothic, we might conclude that *-ari* had been substituted at a later period for *-ja*. There is, however, not the slightest indication that the Westgermanic word for 'fisher' was at any time *fisk-ja* and not *fisk-ari*.

The theory of the Latin origin of *-ar-ja* would be far more plausible, could it be shown that this suffix was imported into the Germanic languages by a large number of Latin loan-words ending in *-ārius*. But the list of these old loan-words which Kluge gives in the second edition of his "*Vorgeschichte der altgermanischen Dialecte*" contains only about half a dozen words in *-ārius* for all the Germanic dialects. Can it seriously be supposed that of these words '*monetārius*, *operārius* and *tolonārius*,' as Kluge thinks (*Zeitschrift für franz. Phil.*, 17, 591) were the types after which hundreds of words in the various Germanic dialects were made?

The most decisive argument against the Latin origin of our suffix is furnished, in my opinion, by the Gothic. Here the suffix *-areis* appears only in eight words, which are the following :

bok-areis
lais-areis
liup-areis

mot-areis
sok-areis
wagg-areis
wull-areis
daimon-areis.

There is no question that Wulfila, as C. Marold, *Germania*, 26, 129 ff., 27, 23 ff., 28, 50 ff., showed, used beside the Greek version, the Latin text of the *Itala*. But none of the Latin equivalents of the Gothic words in *-areis* ends in *-ārius* and, moreover, there is in Gothic no Latin loan-word ending in *-ārius*. The question must, therefore, be asked: was the Gothic language at the time of Wulfila sufficiently influenced by the Latin to justify the formation of words composed of Germanic stems plus the Latin suffix *-ārius*? Only in one case did Wulfila form a loan-word by the suffix *-areis*: in the case of '*daimon-areis*,' and I believe that this word may throw light on the origin of our suffix.

The Greek term for *daimon-areis* is *δαιμονιζόμενος* which the Latin version translates by 'daemonium habens.' Since Wulfila always renders *δαιμόνιον* by *unhulpa* we would expect that he translate *δαιμονιζόμενος* by *unhulpa-areis*. But the Goths evidently were lacking the conception of *δαιμονιζόμενος* which, in the gospel of Mark, is always translated by *wods*. Hence the term *unhulpareis*, not being in use, would have meant nothing to them. For the purpose of introducing the new idea Wulfila seems to have chosen the Greek *daimon*, and he added the suffix *-areis* to convey to the mind of his people the conception of *habens* as in the Latin 'daemonium habens.' The new word *daimonareis* hence became synonymous with *wods* by the force of the suffix *-areis* which the Goths still must have felt as a separate word. If, on the other hand, our suffix had been borrowed from the Latin the form *daimonareis* = *daemonārius* would have remained unintelligible to the readers of Wulfila, since there is no

proof that *-ārius* was used in Gothic to such an extent as to justify its connection with the Greek *daimon*. Besides there is in Latin no such word as *daemon-ārius* which could have become the model for *daimon-areis*.

I believe, therefore, that I am justified in assuming that in Gothic the suffix *-areis* has still the force of an independent word with a definite meaning. This being the case we are able to understand the limited use of our suffix, not only in Gothic but also in the older documents of the Westgermanic dialects. Thus we have it in *Heliand* but four times (*dóperi*, *driogeri*, *fiskari*, *gardari*), in the Old Low Frankian documents ten times, in Grein's *Sprachschatz* sixteen times and in Old Norse Poetry, including later periods, twenty-seven times. Like Gothic *-leiks* in *ga-leiks* and *hwi-leiks* Germanic *-ar-ja* must have been an independent word which originally was used in noun-composition, but owing to Germanic accent afterwards became the extensively used suffix *-er*, the original meaning of which had become obscure.

This original meaning of our suffix will disclose itself if we compare it with Sanskrit *ar-yá*: 'treu, ergeben, zugethan' (Fick, *Wörterbuch der indogerm. Spr.*, I, 168). Germanic *ar-ja*, like Sanskr. *ar-yá*, is, in my opinion, an old verbal-adjective from the root *ar* 'fügen, passen, sich mit etwas zu thun machen' with participial meaning.¹ To be sure *arja* as an independent word is not found in the Germanic dialects, and it seems that the root *ar* in the meaning just given died out altogether in Germanic, which retained *ar* only in the meaning 'to plow,' e. g., Gothic *ar-jan*, O.H.G. *er-ran*. But we have an analogous case in the suffix *-varii*, *var-ja* in tribal names like Amsi-varii, Chas-varii, Chat-varii, etc. The *-var-ja* contained in this suffix does not exist as an independent word and it seems that it was sometimes mixed up with *-ar-ja* as the word *Romāre*, 'Römer,' shows, which is = Ags. *Rom-ware*.

¹ Cf. Brugmann, *Grundriss der Vergl. Gram.*, II, 1, 116 ff.

If the explanation of *-ar-ja* just given is correct its meaning is easily explained. It is essentially that of Sanskrit *ar-yá* = 'angepasst, sich mit etwas zu thun machend,' hence = 'habens.' A *wagg-areis* is = 'was der Wange angepasst ist = Kissen,' a *wull-areis* = 'der sich mit Wolle zu thun macht,' a *daimon-areis* = 'daemonium habens.'

The same meaning of this suffix I find in the hitherto unexplained names of Germanic tribes like *Asc-arii*. *Asc*, as Much, *Zeitschr. f. d. A.*, 41, 94, suggests, means 'spear' and *Asc-arii* are those devoted to or busy with the spear.

But it seems that this suffix also appears as the first member of Germanic proper nouns. Here belong names like *Ario-vistus*, Gothic *Aria-mirus*, *Aria-ricus*, etc., which thus find a satisfactory explanation, since they cannot be connected with Germ. *harja*, Gothic *harjis*, *Heer*.

In conclusion I wish to suggest that this explanation of Germ. *ar-ja* may throw light on the origin of the unexplained Latin *-ārius*. For I do not think that Prellwitz, *Bezenbergers Beiträge*, 24, 94 ff., has succeeded in showing that Latin *-ārius* is an old locative going back to idg. loc. plur. *āsi*.

I agree with Fick who, in the preface to the 4th edition of his *Vergleichende Wörterbuch*, says: "Suffixe sind als bestimmende Wörter zu denken, welche mit den durch sie bestimmten nur in eine engere Verbindung getreten sind. Die Zurückführung der Casussuffixe, Personalendungen des Verbs und Wortbildungssuffixe auf Wörter ist eine unabweisbare Aufgabe der Sprachforschung, die sich auch in manchen Fällen heute schon lösen lässt."

JULIUS GOEBEL.